

WTA ALL THE LATEST NEWS A BIG SUGAR SENSATION

The Electric Refining Process Said to Be a Fraud.

A Story that Rivals the History of the Keely Motor.

A Slump in the Stock in London Leads to Revelations Here.

Interested Parties Said to Have Suddenly Disappeared.

Considerable excitement was occasioned to-day among sugar men by the rumors and revelations that the so-called Electric Sugar Refining Company had proved to be a sort of Keely motor.

Despatches were received in this city yesterday stating that the shares in London had suddenly declined from £83 to £12.

The cause of this decline was said to be the receipt of information from this side of the water to the effect that the supposed mysterious process was a fraud.

The alleged process of refining sugar by electricity was brought to the notice of New York sugar men four years ago. Mr. Henry C. Friend, since deceased, claimed to be the inventor. He insisted that by his secret process refined sugar of a fine quality, therefore unknown could be produced at a nominal cost.

This claim made American investors sceptical, and consequently little American money was invested in the company he formed.

W. H. Cottrell was chosen President and J. A. Robertson Secretary and Treasurer of the Company. But even they were not admitted to the secret of the process.

A building, however, was secured on Hamilton avenue, Brooklyn, and the alleged refining machines and batteries were placed in a secret room. On several occasions raw sugar was taken in at one end of the room and in a marvellously short time it was turned out at the other side in a refined state to the wonder of all beholders.

Finding that the stock did not sell well on this side of the water owing to the persistent scepticism of investors, several of the gentlemen connected with the Company went to England to secure subscriptions there.

Very large blocks of the stock were sold in England at fancy prices.

Some time ago a representative of the English stockholders visited this country and took some of the refined sugar back with him. Soon after he arrived home the stock went up rapidly, and at one time reached £117. Then it gradually fell until yesterday morning it was £83. Then on the strength of certain reports based upon alleged facts which the Company will not, as yet, make public, the stock fell to £12.

J. A. Robertson, Secretary of the Company, was seen at the C. Company's office in this city to-day, and said that he could not exactly explain why the stock had fallen so heavily, but that he could say about the explanation, he continued, "and received this curious answer:

"While there are evidences of fraud at the factory, yet there are certain things which several shareholders here think show there is a true process which we are being deprived of. Every effort is now being made to probe the matter to the bottom.

"Mr. Robertson added that the officers of the Company felt that they had been deceived by the people at the factory, but in what manner he declined to explain. This he declared, while he could say about the matter until some things had been investigated, which they knew comparatively little about now.

H. F. Hitch, a prominent sugar merchant of 112 Front street, being questioned in reference to this business, said this morning that there had been considerable secrecy about the actions of the Company, but along, and that the public knew about it was that so much raw sugar was taken into a secret room, and so much refined sugar, claimed as a result of the process, was sent out of it.

"I have heard the opinion expressed by expert refiners," Mr. Hitch continued, "and men who seem to know something about this Company's affairs, that perhaps they might have used some refined sugar in making the samples that were at first shown, or that the first trials were with such small amounts that when the inventors tried the same process on large amounts it was found to be impracticable. The sugar also has a queer appearance. It is not crystallized like the ordinary granulated sugar, but has a duller appearance, and a number of crystals are struck together."

Late this afternoon it was stated on what seemed to be the authority that the alleged fraud in the Electric Refining Company's process was discovered in this way: The officers broke into the secret room in which the work was done, and satisfied themselves that when the owner of the process tried to use the raw sugar and turn out refined sugar he used refined sugar, which by some means had its appearance changed to look like raw sugar.

Since the death of the alleged inventor, his widow, Mrs. Friend, and her father-in-law, W. E. Howland, are said to have had charge of the secret. Mrs. Friend is reported to have disappeared, and not a few people would like to interview Mr. Howland.

Brooklyn News in Brief.

Among the drunks arraigned this morning before Justice Walsh was Adolph Bickore, a leather merchant, residing at 74 Wilkes street. At the request of friends he was committed to the Inebriates Home for six months.

Josephine Gerech, an eleven-year-old child, was arrested and held this morning on complaint of her father, Charles Gerech, of 44 Jay street, who charges her with being idle and vicious.

William Tarrance, a seaman on the tug Scandinavian, now lying at Atlantic Dock, reports the loss of \$100 worth of clothing and a bank book representing \$900, stolen from the boat during the night.

TILDEN & CO. DISPOSSESSED.

THE GREAT STATESMAN'S NEPHEW'S PECULIAR POSITION.

They Did Not Pay Rent for Their Liberty Street Office. The Western News Service, as the City Marshal Could Not Find Them—Everybody Greatly Surprised, as the Amount Owed is Only \$250.

There was a whistle of surprise in commercial circles this morning, when it became known that Tilden & Co., chemists and pharmacists, at 24 Liberty street, had been dispossessed for non-payment of rent.

The firm is composed of Col. George H. Tilden and Samuel J. Tilden, jr.

The first named partner was a nephew of the late Samuel J. Tilden, and he acquired some little notoriety some time since by contesting his uncle's will.

Mr. Tilden in his will had made certain provisions for the establishment of a free reading-room and library in this city and for other benevolent objects.

Col. George H. Tilden took objection to the clauses which embodied these provisions and declared that they were void because the objects stated therein were vague and incomprehensible. A celebrated array of legal talent was procured by the contestant and by the executors, and the case occupied some time.

In the end Col. Tilden lost the case in the lower courts. By contesting the will, in case of failure, he also loses an inheritance to the tune of a \$75,000 trust fund and the use of certain lands. This was the result of a clause which cut off the benefits from any one who should contest the will.

Col. Tilden, in addition to this disappointment, is surprised that his business has also been decreasing, for during the past six months he has been talking about the "needless expense of the New York stock and asserting his belief that the business was the result of his neglect to pay his rent at 24 Liberty street, and the result was that Mr. Lucius H. Biglow, the owner, instructed Lawyer John H. Napes to bring a suit for dispossession.

City Marshal Leubuscher visited the building yesterday but did not serve the warrant for non-payment of rent, as the Tildens had been notified.

An EVENING WORLD reporter found the colored porter engaged in packing up a few bottles at the store this morning.

"Where is he?"

"New Lebanon," he answered.

"Where is he?"

"Dunno," he answered as he rolled up the whites of his eyes sorrowfully.

"Where are you moving to?"

Lawyer Napes knew nothing beyond the fact that he was instructed to dispossess.

Lawyer Delos McMurtry, who was Col. Tilden's counsel in the recent will contest, said this morning that he had seen Col. Tilden last night, but that he (Col. Tilden) had not mentioned anything of any trouble.

"I know," said Mr. McMurtry, "that Col. Tilden has been talking for a month past about abolishing his New York store, and I also know that he has had a great deal of family trouble, in the way of his nephew's bankruptcy. But I do not know of any business troubles."

"I always believed that the firm was on a substantial basis. I rather think that the Tildens had been making money for some time past, and that because he was not doing business there during that time he thought that there was no necessity for paying rent."

"But I don't believe there is anything wrong. It's rather peculiar, though, isn't it?"

The reporter assented and then left the lawyer to call on the owner of the building. He was not in, but his son, Lucius H. Biglow, jr., said that the Tilden Company was a poor tenant.

"I don't," he said, "we've always had more or less trouble there in collecting our rents."

"Do you know any of the facts of the dispossession?"

"None, except that they didn't pay their rent. That's enough, isn't it? My father tends to all those affairs and we know very little about them."

Both members of the Tilden firm are at their homes in New Lebanon, N. Y., and there seems to be no one else who can throw light on the subject of this queer dispossession.

Surprise is expressed that such a little sum as \$250 should have been allowed to cause so much commotion.

PICKED UP IN MIDOCEAN.

Captain and Crew of the Kate Karnie Saved After Forty-eight Hours of Misery.

The bark Belle Wooster, from Cork, sixty-two days out, arrived here to-day and landed Capt. Lordson and nine men, of the Norwegian bark Kate Karnie, wrecked at sea.

The Belle Wooster fell in with the Kate Karnie on Dec. 16 in latitude 36 degrees, longitude 56.29 degrees. The vessel was waterlogged and her captain and crew had been tossed about in a heavy sea. The vessel sank as soon as her people were taken off.

DUFUR DEFEATS ROSS.

Result of the Wrestling Match in Boston This Afternoon.

(SPECIAL TO THE EVENING WORLD.)

BOSTON, Jan. 4.—In the wrestling match at the Howard Athenaeum this afternoon H. M. Dufur defeated Duncan C. Ross by seven falls to six. The match ended at 4 o'clock.

Van der Horst Drops Baseball.

(SPECIAL TO THE EVENING WORLD.)

BALTIMORE, Md., Jan. 4.—Henry R. Van der Horst has sold his half interest in the Baltimore Baseball Club to Messrs. B. F. Farren and Fred Kelly, who will continue to manage the club. Van der Horst would not say what price has been paid to him, but that he had sold out at a sacrifice. Mr. Kelly said that he will continue to manage the club.

Dr. Carver Left in a Sorrowful Manner.

(SPECIAL TO THE EVENING WORLD.)

MINNEAPOLIS, Minn., Jan. 4.—George D. Jackson, manager for Dr. Carver in his recent match here, is alleged to have left the city, leaving the doctor penniless and under the necessity of telegraphing East for money. His rides were attached yesterday by a newspaper man who had acted as press agent during the match.

The Hamilton Club to Disband.

(SPECIAL TO THE EVENING WORLD.)

HAMILTON, Ont., Jan. 4.—It is quite certain that Hamilton will not be in the International League next year. Matt, Phillips and Mickey Jones were given out yesterday, and Phillips was again named by Rochester. The business men failed to respond to the call for funds.

No lengthy advertisement is necessary to bolster up Dr. SAGE'S CATHARTIC REMEDY.

ON THE YANTIC.

Yellow Fever Starts One of Our War Ships for Home.

Naval Circles Stirred Up Over a Despatch from Admiral Luce.

(SPECIAL TO THE EVENING WORLD.)

WASHINGTON, D. C., Jan. 4.—A sensation has been caused in naval circles by the receipt of a despatch at the Navy Department from Rear Admiral Luce stating that yellow fever had broken out on the Yantic and that she had left Jamaica for New York on that account.

The despatch did not state whether any of the officers had been taken with the fever, and in the absence of such information it is believed that none of them are down with it.

Admiral Luce also stated that the Galea, after coaling at Jamaica, would go back to Port-au-Prince to look after matters there, and that the Haytian Republic remained in a state of anarchy. This was the result of a clause which cut off the benefits from any one who should contest the will.

Col. Tilden, in addition to this disappointment, is surprised that his business has also been decreasing, for during the past six months he has been talking about the "needless expense of the New York stock and asserting his belief that the business was the result of his neglect to pay his rent at 24 Liberty street, and the result was that Mr. Lucius H. Biglow, the owner, instructed Lawyer John H. Napes to bring a suit for dispossession.

City Marshal Leubuscher visited the building yesterday but did not serve the warrant for non-payment of rent, as the Tildens had been notified.

An EVENING WORLD reporter found the colored porter engaged in packing up a few bottles at the store this morning.

"Where is he?"

"New Lebanon," he answered.

"Where is he?"

"Dunno," he answered as he rolled up the whites of his eyes sorrowfully.

"Where are you moving to?"

Lawyer Napes knew nothing beyond the fact that he was instructed to dispossess.

Lawyer Delos McMurtry, who was Col. Tilden's counsel in the recent will contest, said this morning that he had seen Col. Tilden last night, but that he (Col. Tilden) had not mentioned anything of any trouble.

"I know," said Mr. McMurtry, "that Col. Tilden has been talking for a month past about abolishing his New York store, and I also know that he has had a great deal of family trouble, in the way of his nephew's bankruptcy. But I do not know of any business troubles."

"I always believed that the firm was on a substantial basis. I rather think that the Tildens had been making money for some time past, and that because he was not doing business there during that time he thought that there was no necessity for paying rent."

"But I don't believe there is anything wrong. It's rather peculiar, though, isn't it?"

The reporter assented and then left the lawyer to call on the owner of the building. He was not in, but his son, Lucius H. Biglow, jr., said that the Tilden Company was a poor tenant.

"I don't," he said, "we've always had more or less trouble there in collecting our rents."

"Do you know any of the facts of the dispossession?"

"None, except that they didn't pay their rent. That's enough, isn't it? My father tends to all those affairs and we know very little about them."

Both members of the Tilden firm are at their homes in New Lebanon, N. Y., and there seems to be no one else who can throw light on the subject of this queer dispossession.

Surprise is expressed that such a little sum as \$250 should have been allowed to cause so much commotion.

PICKED UP IN MIDOCEAN.

Captain and Crew of the Kate Karnie Saved After Forty-eight Hours of Misery.

The bark Belle Wooster, from Cork, sixty-two days out, arrived here to-day and landed Capt. Lordson and nine men, of the Norwegian bark Kate Karnie, wrecked at sea.

The Belle Wooster fell in with the Kate Karnie on Dec. 16 in latitude 36 degrees, longitude 56.29 degrees. The vessel was waterlogged and her captain and crew had been tossed about in a heavy sea. The vessel sank as soon as her people were taken off.

DUFUR DEFEATS ROSS.

Result of the Wrestling Match in Boston This Afternoon.

(SPECIAL TO THE EVENING WORLD.)

BOSTON, Jan. 4.—In the wrestling match at the Howard Athenaeum this afternoon H. M. Dufur defeated Duncan C. Ross by seven falls to six. The match ended at 4 o'clock.

Van der Horst Drops Baseball.

(SPECIAL TO THE EVENING WORLD.)

BALTIMORE, Md., Jan. 4.—Henry R. Van der Horst has sold his half interest in the Baltimore Baseball Club to Messrs. B. F. Farren and Fred Kelly, who will continue to manage the club. Van der Horst would not say what price has been paid to him, but that he had sold out at a sacrifice. Mr. Kelly said that he will continue to manage the club.

Dr. Carver Left in a Sorrowful Manner.

(SPECIAL TO THE EVENING WORLD.)

MINNEAPOLIS, Minn., Jan. 4.—George D. Jackson, manager for Dr. Carver in his recent match here, is alleged to have left the city, leaving the doctor penniless and under the necessity of telegraphing East for money. His rides were attached yesterday by a newspaper man who had acted as press agent during the match.

The Hamilton Club to Disband.

(SPECIAL TO THE EVENING WORLD.)

HAMILTON, Ont., Jan. 4.—It is quite certain that Hamilton will not be in the International League next year. Matt, Phillips and Mickey Jones were given out yesterday, and Phillips was again named by Rochester. The business men failed to respond to the call for funds.

No lengthy advertisement is necessary to bolster up Dr. SAGE'S CATHARTIC REMEDY.

THE YAWN OF CATHARINE.

IT ENDED IN A DISLOCATION AND A BED AT THE HOSPITAL.

A Pretty German Girl in Brooklyn Whose Mouth Refused to Close for Ten Hours—Now She Keeps It Shut Tightly Enough and She Will Never Startle Her Escort at a New Year's Ball Again.

Miss Catharine Selvers, a young German woman of nineteen, went to a ball given by the Snow Social Club in the Turn Hall, Meserole street, Brooklyn, on Wednesday evening.

This was Ladies' Day in the new year's programme, and Catharine, whose avocation is to look after small children, determined to have a good time. So at a late hour Wednesday night she skipped off to the merry making in the Turn Hall.

She is young and fair and pretty well built for her years. Her plump figure was arrayed in a blue plush gown of walking length, and her face beamed with rosy health and smiles.

That last word recalls the sad fate which befel Catharine after dancing two or three times. Her smile got out of order, and for eight hours Catharine couldn't have smiled a smile if you had paid her \$2.50 for one little modest one. In fact, it looked for a while as if a surgeon would have to come to the rescue of Miss Selvers' smiling apparatus.

She had a pleasant husband, this her somewhat fatigued with her Terpsichorean agility. Then she yawned. The dreadful part of it was that she stayed yawning!

It was not very long before she was a perfect circle, through which her terrified partner desired Catharine's teeth, her red tongue and her gullet.

It was very embarrassing for her. Also for her escort, who, when she saw Catharine keeping up the appearance of an antique mask staring at her with her mouth like a great big "O," was not improved here. "Come off," and then to "Shut up."

Catharine couldn't shut up. Her jaw was locked, and apparently the lock would have to be picked before she could get her lips back into a good, every-day close expression.

She was taken downstairs, her mouth wide open, and put on a chair, while a call was sent to St. Catharine's Hospital, at Bushwick avenue and Ten York street.

It was a dreadful thought to Catharine that perhaps she would have to go through life with her mouth distended like that. Even if she should have a permanent lock, this her speech on his wife's part would hardly have been grateful, because it seemed to show a want of modest reserve in Catharine to exhibit so much of her interior to an unsympathetic public.

It wasn't lack of modesty. It was excess of lock-jaw.

Not until to-day, however, did help come, and then to everybody's satisfaction, Catharine shut her mouth. It was such a relief that they could hardly get her to open it again for two or three minutes.

Mr. Dickson, whose husband says she was a special partner in the Minerva Publishing Company, was first called to testify. She talked to Lawyer Post in general, and about the Company's books and business, and said she knew Timanyen borrowed \$1,600 from Mr. Dickson's brother to put into the affair.

On cross-examination by Abe Hummel the witness said she did not know much about business or the necessary books.

Mr. Dickson succeeded his wife in possession of the witness stand and did not have to do in the name of Timanyen & Co.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the money was never used by the firm. The company had no bank account, but the defendant had one in the name of Timanyen & Co.

Timanyen kept a petty cash book, and witness tried to keep the ledger and other books. About Oct. 25 the defendant took away the cash book.

He testified that Timanyen indirectly put \$1,600 into the business, but that the